

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/070,705	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAMAKI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Thoi V Duong	<b>Art Unit</b> 2871	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thoi V Duong.

(3) Takehiro Mitsui.

(2) Michael E. Monaco. 

(4) \_\_\_\_\_ 

Date of Interview: 30 November 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Maeda, Kita and Moon.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representatives identified many features disclosed in the figures that may distinguish over the cited references. For example, the lip located only on a single side of the frame and/or on the light source side of the device may distinguish. Also, the opposing pair of tabs holding the frame and holding members may distinguish. A clarification of the claims to distinguish the claimed frame and holding members from the upper and lower bodies of Maeda was also discussed .

Docket No: 220334US-2 PCT

**Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form**

Application No.: 10/070,705 First Named Applicant: Tamaki Yasuyuki  
Examiner: Doung Art Unit: 2871 Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tentative Participants:  
(1) Michael E. Monaco (2) \_\_\_\_\_  
(3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_  
Proposed Date of Interview: November 30, 2004 Proposed Time: 2:00 PM  
(1) [ ] Telephonic (2) [XXX] Personal (3) [ ] Video Conference  
Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [XXX] YES [ ] NO  
If yes, provide brief description: Figure 1 of Moon vs. Applicants' claimed and disclosed 'lip'.

**Issues To Be Discussed**

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(2) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(3) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(4) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

[ ] Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.

**NOTE:**

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)